

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

| United States of America, |) Case No. CR 14-0577 EMC |
|--|--|
| Plaintiff, v. | STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL AGT |
| JA QUAN SIMMONS | |
| Defendant. | |
| by the continuance outweigh the best interest o | ord on NOV. 28, 2014, the Court excludes time under the to DEC. 5, 3, 2014 and finds that the ends of justice served of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factor(s): |
| Failure to grant a continuance w See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i | yould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. i). |
| defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreasonable to | inplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial blished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). |
| | of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | yould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. iv). |
| | yould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. iv). |
| IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| DATED: 11-28-14 | JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge |
| STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendan | Assistant United States Attorney |